UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/228,710	01/11/1999	SIMON CHOULDJIAN	17789-000200	8207

7590 08/26/2004

STEPHEN Y PANG
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941113834

EXAMINER	
TRAN, CON P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2644	21

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/228,710	CHOULDJIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Con P. Tran	2644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1, 8-9, 13-14, 17-21, and 25-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickett U.S. Patent 6,154,465 in view of Hall et al. U.S. Patent 4,406,004 (hereinafter, "Hall").

Regarding **claim 1,** Pickett teaches a method (see Fig. 2, 8A-8D, and respective portions of the specification) for providing power within a telephone server coupled to a computer system via an interface bus (see col. 7, lines 20-43), to a maximum number of telephones, and to a telephone trunk (see col. 6, lines 50-61), the computer system providing a primary voltage and a secondary voltage (see col. 32, lines 60-64), the method including:

receiving the primary voltage and the secondary voltage from the computer system (see col. 32, lines 60-64);

generating ringer power in response to the primary voltage (see col. 32, lines 60-64);

generating direct inward dialing power (col. 27, lines 37-40) in response to the primary voltage, the direct inward dialing power configured to provide a first operational voltage for telephones from the maximum number of telephones, when the telephone receive telephone calls directly from the telephone trunk (see col. 31, lines 14-22); and

generating a ringing signal in response to the ringer power and to the secondary voltage (see col. 32, lines 60-64, and col. 12, lines 52-67);

wherein the peak voltage of the ringing signal is provided to a number of telephones at a time (see col. 32, lines 60-64, and col. 16, lines 22-24).

However, Pickett reference does not explicitly disclose a method wherein the peak voltage of the ringing signal is provided to no more than approximately one half of the maximum number of telephones at a time, and wherein the telephones are on separate circuits.

Hall et al. teaches a method wherein the peak voltage of the ringing signal is provided to no more than approximately one half of the maximum number of telephones at a time (see col. 21, line 42 - col. 22, line 29); ringing schedule to organize a schedule of all the telephone lines which are ringing at the central office at a particular time by grouping subscriber lines for each one-second portion of the five –second duty cycle, and send supervisory message, i.e., signal, over the supervisory time slot to that subscriber's phone (col. 22, lines 5-22); and wherein all of the telephones are on

separate circuits (i.e., all the telephone lines in the system, all three subscribers' lines; see col. 21, lines 49-63; col. 22, lines 11-12; in party lines although there is a common line, but each telephone is actually connected by a separate circuit).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated within the Pickett reference a method as taught by Hall et al. because of limited power in remote terminals, as suggested by Hall et al. in column 21, lines 53-54.

Regarding **claim 8,** Pickett further teaches the method of claim 1 (see Fig. 3A and respective portions of the specification) further comprising:

loading driver software for the telephone server (50) on the computer system (see col. 30, lines 13-23); and

configuring the telephone server with the driver software, before providing the ringer power (see col. 30, lines 13-23).

Regarding **claim 9,** Pickett teaches a telephone server coupled to a computer system via a computer bus (see Fig. 3A and respective portions of the specification), configured to provide output power and signals to a plurality of telephones, and to a telephone trunk, the computer system providing a primary voltage and a secondary voltage (see col. 29, line 60 - col. 30, line 12), the telephone server comprising:

a transformer circuit configured to receive the primary voltage and to provide first operational power in response to the primary voltage signal (see col. 13,

lines 1-15; col. 32, lines 60-64), the first operational power configured to power telephones that receiving telephone calls from the telephone trunk (see col. 29, line 60 - col. 30, line 12); and

ringer circuitry coupled to the transformer circuit configured to receive the ringer power, to receive the second voltage, and to provide a ringing signal in response thereto (see col. 12, lines 52-67; col. 32, lines 60-64, and col. 16, lines 22-24);

However, Pickett reference does not explicitly disclose the transformer circuit provides the ringer power to no more than approximately one half a maximum number of telephones that may be coupled to the telephone server at a time; and wherein all of the telephones are on separate telephone lines.

Hall et al. teaches a telephone server (see Fig. 3 and respective portions of the specification), wherein a the peak voltage of the ringing signal is provided to no more than approximately one half of the maximum number of telephones at a time (see col. 21, line 42 - col. 22, line 29); ringing schedule to organize a schedule of all the telephone lines which are ringing at the central office at a particular time by grouping subscriber lines for each one-second portion of the five –second duty cycle, and send supervisory message, i.e., signal, over the supervisory time slot to that subscriber's phone (col. 22, lines 5-22); and wherein all of the telephones are on separate telephone lines (i.e., all the telephone lines in the system, all three subscribers' lines; see col. 21, lines 49-63; in party lines although there is a common line, but each telephone is actually connected by a separate circuit with separate telephone line) because of limited power in remote terminals (see col. 21, lines 53-54).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included within the Pickett reference a telephone server as taught by Hall et al. because of limited power in remote terminals as suggested by Hall et al. in column 21, lines 53-54.

Regarding **claim 13,** Hall et al. further teaches the telephone server of claim 9 (see Fig. 11, 12, and respective portions of the specification),

wherein the ringer circuitry is also configured to receive a ring enable signal (see col. 24, lines 43-56);and

wherein the ringing signal is configured to have a duty cycle of less than approximately 33 percent (see col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10).

Regarding **claim 14,** Hall et al. further teaches the telephone server of claim 13 (see Fig. 3, and respective portions of the specification), wherein the ringer circuit is configured to provide the ringer signal to no more than approximately one third the maximum number of telephones (see col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10).

Regarding **claim 17,** Hall et al. further teaches the telephone server of claim 9 (see Fig. 3, and respective portions of the specification), further comprising:

wherein the transformer circuit (108) is also configured to receive an enabling signal from the computer system (see col. 22, lines 58-68); and

wherein the transformer circuit is also configured to provide the first operational power in response to the enabling signal (see col. 22, line 68 - col. 23, line 10).

Regarding **claim 18,** Pickett teaches a method (see Fig. 1, 2, 3, 3A, 8B, and respective portions of the specification) for a telecommunications interface for providing drive voltages for a plurality of telephones (see col. 6, lines 50-61) coupled thereto, the telecommunications interface also coupled to a computer system (see col. 7, lines 20-43), the computer system providing a first drive voltage and a second drive voltage to the telecommunications interface (see col. 32, lines 41-65), the method including:

receiving an enabling signal for the telecommunications interface from the computer system (see col. 17, lines 35-48);

generating a ringing drive voltage with the telecommunications interface in response to the first drive voltage and to the enabling signal (see col. 17, lines 35-48);

generating a first operational drive voltage for a telephone from the plurality of telephones within the telecommunications interface when a call is directly dialed call from the telephone trunk (see col. 6, line 62 – col. 7, line 11, and col. 32, lines 41-65);

Pickett does not explicitly specify wherein a ringer circuit is configured to provide the ringing drive voltage to a subset of a maximum number of telephone that may be coupled to the telecommunication interface at one time, and wherein all of the telephones are on separate telephone lines.

Hall et al. teaches a line circuit (see Fig. 3 and respective portions of the specification), wherein a ringer circuit (ring generator card, Fig. 10; col. 3, line 53) is configured to provide the ringing drive voltage (by driver 424, col. 23, lines 53-57) to a subset of a maximum number of telephone (col. 21, lines 49-63) that may be coupled to the telecommunication interface at one time (col. 23, line 63 – col. 24, line 14); ringing schedule to organize a schedule of all the telephone lines which are ringing at the central office at a particular time by grouping subscriber lines for each one-second portion (i.e., subset) of the five –second duty cycle, and send supervisory message, i.e., signal, over the supervisory time slot to that subscriber's phone (col. 22, lines 5-22)and wherein all of the telephones are coupled to separate telephone lines (e.g., all three subscribers' lines assigned to a particular two-second portion of the duty cycle have similar ringing conditions, i.e., each of the three telephones assigned to a particular two-second group must be voltage compatible with the other two such that all respond to a +48 volt DC on either the tip or ring line or all respond to a -48 volt DC on either the tip or ring line; see col. 21, lines 49-63; in party lines although there is a common line, but each telephone is actually connected by a separate circuit with separate telephone line).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Hall teaching of line circuit with the method for telecommunications interface of Pickett for purpose of providing limited power in remote terminals, as suggested by Hall in column 21, lines 53-54.

Regarding **claim 19,** Pickett in view of Hall teaches a method (see Fig. 3, and respective portions of the specification) as claimed in claim 18. Hall further teaches providing the first operational drive voltage to the telephone (by driver 424, Fig. 10, col. 23, lines 53-57) when the call is a directly dialed call (see col. 13, lines 1-20).

Regarding **claim 20,** Pickett in view of Hall teaches a method as claimed in claim 18. Hall further teaches a method (see Fig. 11,12, and respective portions of the specification) wherein a first operational drive voltage for the telephone is generated in response to the enabling signal (see col. 22, lines 43-56).

Regarding **claim 21,** Pickett in view of Hall teaches the method as claimed in claim 20. Hall further teaches a method wherein providing a second operational drive to voltage (by driver 426, Fig. 10, col. 23, lines 53-57) for the telephone is generated in response to the enabling signal (see col. 24, lines 43-56).

Regarding **claim 25,** Pickett in view of Hall teaches a method as claimed in claim 18. Hall further teaches a method wherein a peak voltage of ringing drive voltage is provided to no more than approximately one half of the maximum number of telephones at a time (see col. 21, line 42 - col. 22, line 29).

Regarding **claim 26,** Pickett in view of Hall teaches the method of claim 25 (see Fig. 10, and respective portions of the specification). Hall et al. further teaches wherein

the peak voltage of the ringing drive voltage is provided to no more than approximately one third of the maximum number of telephones at a time (see col. 21, line 42 - col. 22, line 29).

Regarding **claim 27,** Pickett in view of Hall teaches the method of claim 26 (see Fig. 10, and respective portions of the specification). Hall et al. further teaches wherein a ring signal derived from the ring drive voltage has a duty cycle of less than approximately 33 percent (see col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10)

3. **Claims 2-6, and 10-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickett U.S. Patent 6,154,465 in view of Hall et al. U.S. Patent 4,406,004, and further in view of Alderman U.S. Patent 4,578,542.

Regarding **claim 2,** Pickett in view of Hall et al. teaches the method of claim 1. Pickett in view of Hall et al. further teaches the peak voltage of the indicator light signal is provided to no more than approximately a half of the maximum number of telephones at a time (see: Pickett col. 16, lines 20-30 and col. 42, lines 35-46; Hall col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10).

However, Pickett and Hall in combination does not explicitly disclose generating an indicator light signal in response to the primary voltage.

Alderman teaches (see Fig. 1 and respective portions of the specification) an indicator light signal in response to the primary voltage (see col. 5, lines 11-28) in order to provide adequate light output (see col. 5, lines 27-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included within the combination of Pickett and Hall an indicator light as taught by Alderman since such combination would have provided adequate light output as suggested by Alderman in column 5, lines 27-28.

Regarding **claim 3,** Pickett in view of Hall et al. and further in view of Alderman further teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

wherein the indicator light signal applied to an indicator light has a duty cycle of approximately 50 percent (see: Pickett col. 16, lines 20-30 and col. 42, lines 35-46; Hall col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10; Alderman col. 5, lines 11-28).

Regarding **claim 4,** Pickett in view of Hall et al. and further in view of Alderman further teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

generating indicator light voltage in response to the primary voltage; wherein the peak voltage of the indicator light voltage is provided no more than approximately a quarter of the maximum number of telephones at a time (see: Pickett col. 16, lines 20-30 and col. 42, lines 35-46; Hall col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10; Alderman col. 5, lines 11-28).

Regarding **claim 5,** Pickett in view of Hall et al. and further in view of Alderman further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the ringing signal is also in response to a ring enable signal and has a duty cycle of approximately 33 percent (see: Pickett col. 16, lines 20-30 and col. 42, lines 35-46; Hall col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10; Alderman col. 5, lines 11-28).

Regarding **claim 6,** Pickett in view of Hall et al. and further in view of Alderman further teaches the method of claim 5 wherein a peak voltage of the ringing signal is provided to no more than approximately one third of the maximum number of telephones at a time (see: Pickett col. 16, lines 20-30 and col. 42, lines 35-46; Hall col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10).

Regarding **claim 10**, this claim merely reflects the apparatus to the method claim of claim 2 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 11,** Pickett in view of Hall et al. and further in view of Alderman further teaches the telephone server of claim 10 wherein the indicator light circuitry is configured to provide an indicator light signal in response to the indicator light power (see Alderman col. 5, lines 11-28), wherein the indicator light signal is configured to have a duty cycle of less than approximately 25 percent (see Hall col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10).

Regarding **claim 12,** Pickett in view of Hall et al. and further in view of Alderman further teaches the telephone server of claim 9 further comprising:

wherein the transformer circuit is also configured to provide the indicator light power in response to the primary voltage (see Alderman Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 11-28); and

wherein indicator light circuitry is configured to provide a peak voltage of the indicator light power to no more than approximately one half the maximum number of telephones (see Hall Fig. 10; col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10).

4. **Claim 7,15-16, and 28** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickett U.S. Patent 6,154,465 in view of Hall et al. U.S. Patent 4,406,004 (hereinafter, "Hall") and further in view of Amoni et al. U.S. Patent 5,884,086 (hereinafter, "Amoni").

Regarding **claim 7,** Pickett in view of Hall teaches the method of claim 1.

Pickett in view of Hall further teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising generating second operational voltage (-24 volts; see Pickett col. 32, lines 60-64; col. 33, lines 29-34; col. 16, lines 22-24;) in response to the primary voltage for telephones from the maximum number of telephones, when the telephone receive telephone calls from other telephones from the maximum number of telephones (see Hall col. 21, lines 49-63); However, Pickett in view of Hall does not explicitly disclose the first operational voltage is approximately twice the second operational voltage.

Amoni et al. teaches (see Fig. 2 and respective portions of the specification) a first operational voltage is approximately twice the second operational voltage (see col. 4, lines 51-65) in order to operate seamless with non-auxiliary powered devices (see col. 4, lines 9-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included within the Pickett in view of Hall a first operational voltage as taught by Amoni et al. since such combination would have provided to operate seamless with non-auxiliary powered devices as suggested by Amoni in column 4, lines 9-10.

Regarding **claim 15,** Pickett in view of Hall et al. teaches telephone server of claim 9.

However, Pickett in view of Hall does not explicitly disclose the first operational voltage is greater than the second operational voltage.

Amoni et al. teaches (see Fig. 2 and respective portions of the specification) a first operational voltage is greater than the second operational voltage (see col. 4, lines 51-65) in order to operate seamless with non-auxiliary powered devices (see col. 4, lines 9-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included within the Pickett in view of Hall a first operational voltage that greater than the second as taught by Amoni et al. since such

combination would have provided to operate seamless with non-auxiliary powered devices, as suggested by Amoni in column 4, lines 9-10.

Regarding **claim 16,** Amoni et al. further teaches telephone server of claim 15 wherein the first operational voltage is approximately twice the second operational voltage (see col. 4, lines 51-65).

Regarding **claim 28,** Pickett in view of Hall teaches a method as claimed in claim 18. Pickett further teaches generating a second operational drive voltage for the telephone within the telecommunication interface when an the call is directed to the telephone of the plurality of telephones is for the telephone (see col. 6, lines 51-61, and col. 32, lines 41-65); and

providing the second operational drive voltage to the telephone when the internally dialed call (see col. 12, lines 52-67).

However, Pickett in view of Hall does not explicitly disclose a method wherein the first operational drive voltage has a magnitude approximately twice a magnitude of the second operational drive voltage.

Amoni teaches (see Fig. 2 and respective portions of the specification) a first operational drive voltage has a magnitude approximately twice a magnitude of the second operational drive voltage (see col. 4, lines 51-65) in order to operate seamless with non-auxiliary powered devices (see col. 4, lines 9-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included within the Pickett, Hall in combination a first operational voltage as taught by Amoni et al. since such combination would have provided to operate seamless with non-auxiliary powered devices, as suggested by Amoni in column 4, lines 9-10.

5. **Claims 22-24** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickett U.S. Patent 6,154,465 in view of Hall et al. U.S. Patent 4,406,004 (hereinafter, "Hall") and further in view of Alderman U.S. Patent 4,578,542.

Regarding **claim 22,** Pickett in view of Hall teaches the method as claimed in claim 18. However, Pickett in view of Hall does not explicitly disclose method further comprising: generating an indicator light drive voltage within the telecommunication interface in response to the primary voltage.

Alderman teaches (see Fig. 1 and respective portions of the specification) a method comprising generating an indicator light drive voltage within the telecommunication interface in response to the primary voltage (see col. 5, lines 11-28) in order to provide adequate light output (see col. 5, lines 27-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included within the Pickett reference an indicator light as taught by Alderman since such combination would have provided adequate light output as suggested by Alderman in column 5, lines 27-28.

Regarding **claim 23,** Pickett, Hall and Alderman in combination teaches the method as claimed in claim 22. Pickett, Hall and Alderman in combination further teaches a method (see Fig. 3 and respective portions of the specification) wherein drive voltage is provided to no more than approximately one half of the maximum number of telephones at a time (see Hall, col. 21, line 42 - col. 22, line 29) wherein a peak voltage of the indicator light drive voltage is provided to indicator lights of a number of telephones at a time (see Alderman, col. 5, lines 11-28).

Regarding **claim 24,** Pickett, Hall and Alderman in combination further teaches the method as claimed in claim 23: wherein the peak voltage of the indicator light drive voltage is provided (see Alderman, col. 5, lines 11-28) to no more than approximately one quarter of the maximum number of telephones at a time (see Hall col. 20, line 51 - col. 21, line 10).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed June 7, 2004 regarding claims 10-28 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Applicants assert on pages 7-8:

> First, amended claim 1 is patently distinct over the Hall reference for reciting, in part, "wherein all of the telephones are on separate circuits."

> Hall only discloses Bell System party lines, in which "up to four subscribers maybe simultaneously attached to one line," and independent telephone company party lines, in which "up to five phones may be simultaneously connected to a party line." (col. 20, lines 32-34, 53-55). Because Hall makes no disclosure of a system in which "all of the telephones are on separate circuits," amended claim 1 is patently distinct over the Hall reference for at least this claim limitation. Pickett does not make up for this deficiency in Hall.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As presented above in the Office action, Examiner interprets "on separate circuits" and "on separate telephone lines" as "in party lines although there is a common line, but each telephone is actually connected by a separate circuit with separate telephone line".

Applicants further assert on page 10:

> "In both cases, Hall discloses a system in which the ringing signal is applied to all the telephones at the same time and selectivity is achieved through phones with differing responsively."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As presented above in the Office action, Hall teaches ringing schedule to organize a schedule of all the telephone lines which are ringing at the central office at a particular time by grouping subscriber lines for each one-second portion of the five –second duty cycle, and send supervisory message, i.e., signal, over the supervisory time slot to that subscriber's phone (col. 22, lines 5-22).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Con P. Tran, whose telephone number is (703) 305-2341. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (8:30 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W. Isen can be reached on (703) 305-4386. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service Office at telephone number (703) 306-0377.

cpt CPJ
August 21, 2004

XU MEI
PRIMARY EXAMINER